AN

ANSWER

TO THE

PAMPHLET,

INTITULED,

"*Arguments for and againſt an Union,*"

&c. &c.

IN A

LETTER

ADDRESSED TO

EDWARD COOKE, Esq.

SECRETARY AT WAR.

BY

PEMBERTON RUDD, Esq.

BARRISTER AT LAW.

NEW EDITION.

London:

Re-printed for JOHN STOCKDALE, Piccadilly, 1798.

[*Price Six Pence.*]

ADVERTISEMENT.

IN the year 1786, Mr. Stockdale re-printed DE FOE'S HISTORY OF THE UNION BETWEEN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND, with an Introduction by De Lolme, and a Life of De Foe by Mr. Chalmers.

At that time, not a copy was to be purchaſed at any price, until accident put one into the publiſher's poſſeſſion, which he immediately ſent to preſs. The ſale was rapid, as the "IRISH PROPOSITIONS" then agitated both kingdoms. At that period, Mr. Pitt had, no doubt, an Union in view; but it was ſoon diſcovered, that the great landed intereſt was, as fifteen to twenty, againſt it: It is now well known, that the majority of the ſame leading intereſt is in a ſimilar proportion in its favour.

The conduct of the ill-diſpoſed, artful, and deſigning, with their influence over the lower claſſes, and the rebellious ſpirit which has pervaded the peaſantry, is the cauſe of this great change in the opinion of the beſt informed of that Nation, which had thereby been rendered an unſafe reſidence for the land owner, unleſs he declared himſelf an "United Iriſhman," and even then, neither his property nor perſon were ſecure, as numerous examples have evinced.

The Union will ſoon be propoſed in the Iriſh, and it is hoped, approved of in the Engliſh Parliament.

It can only be imputed to the liberality of the Britiſh Nation, that it be not united in one body to oppoſe it, as to Ireland it is that the great advantages muſt ariſe, which will, after the completion of ſuch a Union, ſoon be realized.

Engliſh merchants and traders will migrate, and quickly infuſe into the willing, but miſled, Iriſh, the ſocial and profitable comforts reſulting from induſtry.

The manners of England will become the manners of Ireland, and the Nobility, &c. will ſoon be convinced that their perſons and families will be ſacred on Iriſh ground.

The affrighted Lawyers will be the firſt to rejoice at the event, as from the increaſe of wealth their profits will be doubled.

There is every reaſon to believe that Iriſh Lords and Iriſh Commoners will ſhortly be ſeen ſitting in the Britiſh Houſe of Repreſentatives

BRITISH MUSEUM 4 3. 29. 262.

Repreſentatives in aid and ſupport of the Engliſh Conſtitution, which, like its King, knows no good but what is univerſal.

From the unanimity obſervable in every well-diſpoſed Engliſh and Iriſh gentleman, little doubt can remain but that as we are under one king, ſo we may be under one and the ſame law; and being only divided, as it were, by a canal of eaſy communication, in ONE GREAT UNION.

Piccadilly,
19th December 1798.

The following Liſt of the Commiſſioners to be appointed, having probability in its favour, has been copied from the "Times" of this day; but as the topic of Religion ought to be a firſt conſideration, the ſubſequent addition may not be conſidered as improper:

The Archbiſhop of Canterbury and Biſhop of London, on the part of England.

The Archbiſhops of Armagh and Dublin, on the part of Ireland.

The following is a liſt of the Commiſſioners for arranging the Articles of the Union between Great Britain and Ireland, as it is ſuppoſed they will be choſen as ſoon after the meeting of the Iriſh Parliament as the Addreſs to his Majeſty can be framed and laid before it.

For ENGLAND:

Sir John Scott, Attorney General.
Sir John Mitford, Solicitor General.
Henry Addington, Speaker of the Commons.
Lord Loughborough, Chancellor.
William Pitt, Chancellor of the Exchequer.
Henry Dundas, Secretary of State.
Earl Spencer, Firſt Lord of the Admiralty.
Lord Grenville, Secretary of State.
Sir William Scott, Judge of the Admiralty.
A Member for Liverpool.
Sir A. Macdonald, Lord Chief Baron.
Duke of Portland, Secretary of State.
Earl of Liverpool, Preſident of the Committee of Council for Trade.
Lord Mayor of London.
John Reeves, Eſq; Secretary to the Commiſſion.

For

For IRELAND:

J. Stewart, Solicitor General.
John Toler, Attorney General.
James Fitzgerald, Prime Serjeant.
John Forſter, Speaker of the Commons.
Sir John Parnell, Chancellor of the Exchequer.
John Beresford, Commiſſioner of Cuſtoms.
Earl of Clare, Chancellor.
Lord Yelverton, Chief Juſtice of Common Pleas.
Lord Kilwarden, Chief Juſtice of King's Bench.
John Claudius Beresford, M. P. Dublin City
Lord Boyle, M. P. Cork City.
Edward Cooke, Eſq; Secretary to the Commiſſion.

We do not pledge ourſelves that the above liſt is ſo correct that there ſhall neither be a name altered, added, nor diminiſhed; at the ſame time we believe that it will prove pretty accurate. The event is much to be wiſhed by every diſintereſted friend to both countries.

BRITISH MUSEUM

AN

ANSWER, &c.

SIR,

WHEN I addreſs YOU, or ANY man, (to whom I have not the honour to be perſonally known) my firſt care is—not to be miſunderſtood;—my firſt hope—not to offend.

The queſtion (Union or no Union) is become no novelty to the minds of the Citizens of Dublin, and I ſhould be excuſeable, perhaps, in diſcuſſing it without preface. Yet, as I make YOUR name the uſher of MY ſentiments to the Public, I hold myſelf bound to account to you, Sir, why I preſume to do ſo.

I have read a Pamphlet, (read it, in MANY places with admiration, and I hope, in ALL with reſpect and temper)—I have read a Pamphlet, intituled "*Arguments for and againſt an Union between Great Britain and Ireland*;" and I have heard, (univerſally heard) that YOU are its author.

IF you are NOT the author of the pamphlet in queſtion, I beg you to conſider the few following ſheets, merely as a dedication, (nothing more) to a gentleman, who happens, in theſe times of wars and rumours of wars, to fill a very high and confidential office in the military department of this country, with the aſſiduity of a man of buſineſs, and the manners of a gentleman. IF you ARE the author of that pamphlet, I have no apology to make. I ſhall treat you, as I hope to be treated myſelf; read you with ſeverity and criti-

ciſm;

ciſm ; *ſtrive* to anſwer you with candour, ſincerity, and truth. I may diſſent from your deductions as a politician—without outraging your feelings as a gentleman. To you, then, Sir, no more—to the Public, eſpecially the Dublin Public, who have read your pamphlet——

"AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM."

You ſet out by ſaying, and you ſay truly, that the Union is a queſtion of extent and importance; that it applies warmly to the feelings—I believe indeed you ſay, "to all the feelings of the human mind;" but, alas! there are ſome men, who have ſome feelings, to which argumentative applications were in vain; for, they are "armed ſo ſtrong in"—(I was going to ſay "honeſty,") "that they paſs by them as the idle winds, which they reſpect not." You ſay, it is a queſtion cannot fail to be univerſally debated; but you expreſs your fear "that it will not be PROPERLY debated." I am ſorry you ſhould have carried the rules of academic theme-writing into the compoſition of a political pamphlet; I am ſorry you ſhould have elucidated your poſition, by your perſonal example! Yet, I confeſs, you have made a convert of me. I have read your pamphlet, and I agree with you, that the Union is a ſubject which MAY not be PROPERLY debated.

But of this—more anon:——

Though I do not completely ſubſcribe to the order, even, in which you have arranged your arguments; yet as I preſume to anſwer you, I hold myſelf obliged to follow you. I think it my duty to attend you, "*ſeriatim et literatim*," through every page and line of a production, likely to intereſt ſo deeply every man I value in ſociety. In yourſelf, I believe, you are entitled to all poſſible conſideration and deference to your opinions—but I go farther than that: I believe, and ſo do thouſands as well I—that you ſpeak the ſentiments, at leaſt, that you hold out the reaſonings of men higher in political conſequence than yourſelf: and that we, poor people at the *outſide* of the curtain, who are too far removed from

the

the machinery of State Pieces, to ſee the wires which conduct the Pantomime; can only gueſs at what paſſes behind the Scenes, from the now-and-then glimpſe of the hand of the Prompter. We *muſt* argue *from* you *to* them: What you would venture to ſay, you or they might hazard to do: it is all one, "QUI FACIT PER ALIUM, FACIT PER SE."

Well then, Sir, You would have a Union? Is it ſo? But you would "diſcuſs it *fairly*," and to prove your ſincerity, you ſay you will begin by ſtating the queſtion in the Abſtract; viz. (Page 5) "Two independent "States, finding their ſeparate exiſtence mutually in-"convenient, propoſe to form themſelves into one "State, for their mutual benefit." I deny your poſtulatum: I never heard one ſingle Engliſhman repine at his ſeparate exiſtence, deprecate his mutual inconveniences, or pray to unite his fate through life, with ſuch a dower-leſs termagant Conſort as poor Ireland. Nay, I am yet to learn, that even the moſt inſignificant *cloſe* Borough in *this* kingdom has petitioned either his Majeſty or the Parliament, to adviſe—to promote—or to effect an Union. I look in vain for the documents whence you collect your hypotheſis: The Quarry muſt be a plaguy ſecret one, from which you have hewn this corner ſtone of your edifice. Yet you ſay, "nothing can be deviſed more fit for ſober and philoſophic argument." I think it looks bad in proſe, yet it might make neat argument to a Canto of Poetry, for it is pretty fiction.

The light of hiſtory is, beyond queſtion, ſingularly uſeful in ſhewing us the ſtumbling blocks which tripped up our forefathers, and pointing to us the way which we ourſelves ſhould go. The Author of the Pamphlet before me, has availed himſelf of every—even the moſt antique illumination on the ſubject, and has ſelected no leſs than TWO examples to prove that an Iriſh Union would be a "good thing." Of theſe two examples, it is true, that one is a few thouſand years poſterior to the other. It is in the Pamphlet however, (page 6.) put firſt, and ſo I take it—I mean the example of the Seven

United

United Provinces, which were (to uſe the Author's own words) "cruelly oppreſſed by the Spaniſh government, &c. and ſo "they ſeparated to eſcape tyranny," &c." and the Author ſays "they did right." Now, is this an argument for an Iriſh Union?

But, no doubt, the ſtrong argument is kept for the laſt—I have dwelt on it with attention, and it runs in theſe words: "When the Sabines found they could "not maintain themſelves any longer againſt the Ro- "mans, and ſaw that by uniting with them they had an "opportunity of encreaſing their liberty, their hap- "pineſs, and their power; they acted according to the "principles of reaſon and right in relinquiſhing their "ſeparate independency as a ſtate, *and by their Union* "*laid the foundation of Roman Greatneſs.*" Apply the parallel. Have the Sabines (i. e. the Iriſh) *found* that they cannot maintain themſelves *any longer* againſt the Romans, (i. e. the Engliſh)? Do the Iriſh ſee, that by uniting with them they have an opportunity of encreaſing their liberty, their happineſs, and (oh! monſtrous!) their power? Will even the Author of the Pamphlet anſwer theſe queſtions in the affirmative? And if he does, ſtill what becomes of his concluſion, viz. "and by that Union, laid the foundation of their "greatneſs." Of whoſe greatneſs? Of Roman, *Roman* greatneſs. What became even of the very name of Sabine? Was it not loſt, merged, overwhelmed, and engulphed in the vortex of Roman Rapacity? The Sabines aggrandized the Romans: admitted! Do you want the Iriſh to aggrandize Great Britain? She don't need it—She is no adjective ſtate: In the political grammar of Europe, England can ſtand alone!!! PROUDLY ALONE! and were it otherwiſe, what Iriſhman would ſnatch the ſtaff from the hand of Hibernia, ſcarce yet able to ſtand erect, or walk alone; to place it in the graſp of a Siſter, older, richer, greater, and ſtronger; to be hereafter uſed, perhaps, as the inſtrument of unmerited infliction,—at beſt, as the Mace of arrogant ſuperiority. Nay, farther; ſuppoſing every poſſible good conſequence, eventually, to ariſe from it:

My mind has an inſurmountable antipathy to the old *forcible* reaſons which muſt be the neceſſary forerunners to aſſimilate theſe caſes: I ſhould be grieved even to agony, to find the *raviſhing* arguments which overcame the Sabines, applied to my fair, my honoured, my virtuous Country-women: and deeply ſhould I fear, that the produce of ſuch an Union would be deſerted, or contemned, as a baſtard, and inſtead of being cheriſhed with the milk of human kindneſs, would be ſtinted in its nouriſhment and *ſuckled by a wolf*. If the Author *will* have Sabine Hiſtory, why did he forget to hint at the fate of Sabine Tatius? It might be no inapplicable caution to the Iriſh promoters of an Union. As the Author proceeds to except eſpecially to every argument drawn from what he calls "the common-"place topics of national dignity and national pride"—I forbear to touch on them: indeed on that head, there can *not* be TWO opinions, and the queſtion with which he begins, (page 6) is a *petitio principii*.

I deny that the conſolidation of the ſeparate ſhires of the Heptarchy into one empire, nay, even the junction of the kingdom of Scotland to England, can at this day furniſh a juſt and reaſonable parallel to an Union between this Country and Great Britain. Independent of the other reaſons of popular pre-opinions, (for I will not libel them with the term prejudices) independent of nationality and other arguments to be touched on hereafter, Nature herſelf ſeems to have interpoſed local obſtacles and impediments to ſuch an undertaking—Nature had not dealt with Scotland as with Ireland—She had not expanded the boſom of the Tweed to the breadth of the Iriſh Channel, nor dropt the Scottiſh Hebrides like the verdant plains of Ireland,

"A PRECIOUS GEM! SET IN THE SILVER SEA."

SHAKESPEAR'S RICHARD 2nd.

The Author proceeds to make juſt diſtinctions between queſtions of choice and of neceſſity. I pray

 Heaven!

Heaven! they never may become diſtinctions without difference.

An Union is compared, (page 7) to a partnerſhip. But we ſhould not forget that by the very articles of partnerſhip, an eternal relinquiſhment of our little capital would be a SINE-QUA-NON. Our hopes of benefit from this fine participation in an extenſive and a wealthy ferme *might* be diſappointed; we *might* pine to withdraw ourſelves from this great ſcale of things, and carry on buſineſs in an humbler, happier ſphere: But where or how is the once-relinquiſhed capital to be ſubtracted? Alas! the Independence and the Conſtitution we have once parted with, is gone and ſurrendered for ever! And truly ſhould we *never* wiſh to diſſolve the connection, I ſee no mighty comfort or reſpectability attached to the ſituation, at leaſt of the *poor* copartner. Muſt he not travel every ſitting to the counting-houſe of his more wealthy ally, who takes care to keep the books and the coffers in his own parlour: and when at laſt the profits of the ferme are to be diſtributed, he receives, not a ſhare, but a ſtipend, and diſcontentedly departs, not with the honourable dividend of a partner, but the galling wages of a clerk?

In caſe of an Union, the Author thus lays down the relative circumſtances of each partner, or State: Ireland, "inferior in point of Civilization, Agriculture, Commerce, Manufactures, Morals, Manners, Eſtabliſhments, Conſtitution;" England, "Eminent and Superior in all!" "Then," (ſays he) is it not evident, "the former muſt be amazingly benefited by an Union?" What! are we to ſuppoſe, or would he infer that England would unconditionally, gratuitouſly, and without moſt weighty correſponding ſacrifices upon our part, be ſo *unnaturally* generous, as to *force* theſe benefits upon us? Ah!——

"TIMEO DANAOS, ET DONA FERENTES."

I would beſeech Iriſhmen to pauſe, before they ruſh into the arms of ſuch deceitful blandiſhment; and beware

beware how they ſurrender a conſtitution, they never can recal!

But if I have hitherto diſſented from the arguments of the Pamphlet before me, how ſhall I expreſs my ſurprize and aſtoniſhment, at the language of the 8th and 9th pages, in which the example of France—yes! of lawleſs, graſping, robbing France, is held up as the mirror to nations; and as the alluring example to—what? to *Indiviſibility and Union!* Not to dwell upon the horror with which every honeſt native of England and Ireland have been forced to look at every political act of that all-graſping and unprincipled people; not to mention the moral turpitude, nor the political infidelity of the principle, ſurely, if this example or parallel of our author proves any thing, it proves too much; for if England (in caſe of an Union) is to become like overgrown France, Ireland (to carry on his own parallel) muſt be Geneva, which our author TELLS us is incorporated, and which WE KNOW is enſlaved; or, ſhe muſt be Savoy, which he alſo tells us is incorporated, and which we know has been deluged in blood; or ſhe muſt be Auſtrian Flanders or Spain, the one convulſed with factions and intrigue, the other trembling from her vicinity to plunderers, to whoſe rapacity and avarice the Pyrenees are Mole-hills; or ſhe muſt be Holland, Switzerland, Sardinia, or the new Republic of Italy—take your choice. Glorious examples all of fraternal Union, and the bleſſings of ſtrict political Indiviſibility! I confeſs I am ſtartled at this whole paſſage; and though I have read it often, I ſhould doubt that I had read it aright, were it not for the very unequivocal ſentences which follow: "France well knows the principle and the force of incorporations." "Every ſtate which ſhe unites to herſelf, ſhe makes part of her empire, ONE and INDIVISIBLE," &c. &c. Indeed I ſhould not have reliſhed this implied approbation of the predatory policy of our enemy, even in a common writer: but when I find it flow from a pen, which we muſt ſuppoſe to have been dipped in the ink, perhaps, of the Privy-council-chamber, and

guided by an official hand, I acknowledge my wonder without reſerve. "*France!* ONE and INDIVISIBLE!!!" For God's ſake, if her pernicious ſyſtem muſt be held forth at all, let it be exhibited as a warning to deter, not diſplayed as a model for imitation. We have lately had one kind of Union (as they called it) attempted for Ireland, and, thanks to the Providence of Almighty God, to the valour and true patriotiſm of the Yeomanry of Ireland, and to the prudence, vigilance, and energy of Government, that wicked, bloody, and unnatural attempt, recoiled on the heads which planned it; the political blunderbuſs burſt in the hands which dared to preſent it! Again I ſay—let Iriſhmen beware of an Union!

Though the Pamphlet before me, and which I am thus preſuming to analyze, be entitled, "Arguments for and againſt an Union," I am able (as yet) to diſcover no arguments, but what are enliſted (ſome of them actually preſſed) into the ſervice of the PRO ſide of this queſtion: unleſs, indeed, we are to conſider ſome of them as being veritably intended (by a very delicate irony of the author) to undermine the very cauſe to which common and plain-judging apprehenſions, might think them applied as ſupporters; and truly of this claſs, might be ſuppoſed the argument of page 9; where the author ſtates the loſs which the ſecondary ſtate or province muſt always and neceſſarily ſuſtain, from the non-reſidence of only ONE branch of the legiſlative aggregate, namely, the Sovereign; and yet (uncandidly enough, methinks) paſſes over, nay, totally omits the obvious and palpable inference, *a fortiori*, of how very much theſe ſaid loſſes muſt be extended, multiplied, and aggravated, (in caſe of ſuch indiviſible Union), when not only the king would continue an abſentee, but the whole houſe of peers, (late reſidents in this kingdom) would become abſentees, and not only king and peers be abſent, but all the whole three branches of the legiſlature, King, Lords, Commons! ALL abſentees. I have ſaid the *whole* Houſe of Peers, and I think it will not be difficult

ficult to ſupport the ſuppoſition; for if you deduct, in the firſt inſtance, the number of elective peers, who muſt neceſſarily repair to attend parliamentary duties every ſeſſion, to London, (twenty, ſuppoſe—if, indeed, England would be ſo good as to allow us ſo many), if you then deduct the number of other Iriſh peers, who, from Engliſh political intereſts, Engliſh matrimonial connections, and ſundry other cauſes, have been induced, and no doubt would continue to be additionally induced, to accept and ſolicit ſeats in the Engliſh Houſe of Commons, I believe we ſhall find the catalogue of Iriſh reſident peers, reduced to a very contracted liſt indeed. I ſuppoſe the number of Commoners required or allowed to Iriſh repreſentation, in caſe of an Union, might be ſixty or ſeventy: it muſt be admitted to me, that theſe ſixty or ſeventy, would probably be from the moſt wealthy and reſpectable claſs of Iriſh gentry, and they alſo would be forced to become abſentees. Then calculate the number of individuals, (the neceſſary ſatellites on each of theſe moving political planets) you will find, that including wives, children, tutors, ſervants, &c. &c. the proportion of twenty-five dependents on each member of Parliament, annually EXPORTED, would be no very unreaſonable ſuppoſition. Then calculate the probable amount of ſpecie which muſt be tranſmitted annually (from rack-rents, and Lord knows what elſe) to London, for the maintenance of each of theſe eighty or ninety exported Lords and Commoners, and alſo for the maintenance of each of the twenty-five dependents attendant upon the ſaid eighty or ninety members, and you will then ſee the enormous drawback of rank, conſequence, and property, which would, of courſe, take place; nay—Vanity and Faſhion would ſtill further thin this deſolated metropolis, and where would be the amends? Why, in the very cheap rate at which the thouſands of troops neceſſary, in that event, to keep this city in order, would be accommodated with barracks; our ſplendid Parliament Houſe would ſet, perhaps, at twenty ſhillings PER COLUMN, per annum; and that enchanting model of architectural beauty, the envy

and

and admiration of ſtrangers, would hereafter be viewed but as the ſad and ſullen mauſoleum, in which the Iriſh Parliament would have interred the peace, the honour, the dignity, and the independence of the LATE IRISH NATION.

But to return to your Pamphlet. You lament, (page 10) that the Iriſh parliament is *(now)* ſuppoſed under Britiſh influence, and you allow, that even now, near one million of the rents of this kingdom are annually exported to abſentees. Permit me to aſk, would your propoſed Union leſſen or ameliorate theſe cauſes of complaint? If three hundred of the firſt men in this kingdom, ſitting in College Green in Dublin, muſt be ſuppoſed under Britiſh influence, what muſt we conclude would be the caſe with ſixty of thoſe *very* perſons, when tranſplanted to St. Stephen's chapel, in London? Good God! Sir! Are you not arguing FOR ME by anticipation, or have you miſtaken the ſide of the water at which you ſhould have publiſhed your arguments? To my intellects, you are forcibly proving to the Engliſh nation, how much more cheaply they *might* govern the Iriſh people than they do at preſent. You write as an Engliſhman to Engliſhmen; I write, and ſpeak, and FEEL as an Iriſhman, and I call on Iriſhmen to hear me!

As to the 11th page, about the Scotch and the Pretender, I can diſpach it in a trice—

TEMPORA MUTANTUR, ET NOS MUTAMUR AB ILLIS.

There can be little danger upon that head now; and as to any ſuppoſed or aſſumed ſimilarity between the ſtate of Scotland, in the reign of Queen Anne, and the preſent circumſtances of this kingdom, (vide page 11) that argument has already been anticipated, and neatly and judiciouſly refuted by Mr. Spencer, in his elegant little work, "*Thoughts on a Union.*" A period of ninety-one years has not paſſed over the nations of Europe, without bringing in its train ſuch advantages of every kind, and ſuch increaſe of property and population, as have greatly altered the circumſtances of men and things, in the two countries: Nor can I think, Sir, that you have been a jot more happy in your

AMERICAN

AMERICAN parallel, with which you proceed to fill the three or four next pages, than you were in your Sabine compariſon, or your equally fortunate alluſions to the Netherlands, and to the Ciſalpine and Tranſalpine Republics. American conſolidation can furniſh no fair or juſt parallel to the caſe before us: Ireland and England are two ſeparate KINGDOMS, the States of America were thirteen diſtinct REPUBLICS; the American Union was a federal one; the Union you propoſe for Ireland is, if I underſtand it right, an incorporated, NOT a federal Union. Beſides, no *natural* boundaries ever ſeparated the States of America; *their* ſeveral frontiers were in all parts arbitrary and artificial, and in ſome, imaginary.

We come now to that part of the work (page 13.) in which our Author enters on a relative calculation of the quantity of property in Ireland, and the different religions of its preſent poſſeſſors: and ſtates the number of Roman Catholic inhabitants of this kingdom to be, to the Proteſtants, in the proportion of four to one: while the property of the latter is eſtimated to exceed that of the former by the groſs amount of ten to one. Let us examine this ſtatement: It is a point of infinite magnitude, and I much fear that a miſtaken confidence on this very ſubject has been one of the cauſes (and perhaps not one of the leaſt momentous) that produced thoſe claims and troubles, which have ſo lately agitated Ireland. I know it has been but too frequently aſſerted, that the Catholics of this country are in round numbers three fourths of its inhabitants; yet I hope to PROVE, before I diſmiſs this poſition, that ſuch a ratio neither is, or can be true.

In the year 1731, a ſurvey of this kingdom was had, and a very accurate CENSUS of its inhabitants taken, diſtinguiſhing the relative proportion of Catholic and Proteſtant occupiers in each diſtrict, in each county, and finally in each province. This work was executed by order of government, publiſhed the following year, 1732; and the faith of the government of the country pledged to its veracity. The proportion of

Catholics to Proteſtants was therein ſtated, and aſcertained by documents which could not be refuted, to be on the ſcale of the whole kingdom as two and an half and a fraction to one, or in round numbers as five to two. Now if ſixty ſeven years ago, when the power of the Pope was ſurely higher than at preſent, and when Ireland had not received the addition of the numbers of Engliſh Proteſtant ſettlers, traders, and adventurers, who, with their families, have ſince come over amongſt us; I ſay, if at that period, ſuch was the proportion of the two religions, it is now fair reaſoning to conclude that the exceſs, inſtead of encreaſing, has been diminiſhed. During the whole of this period, the proteſtant has been pretty generally the perſuaſion of the higher ranks of ſociety; of courſe, it became ſo of thoſe whom their patronage biaſſed, or their charity ſupported: beſides, the Catholic, until very lately, laboured under ſuch perſonal diſabilities, that he could not breed up his ſon to any of the learned profeſſions; and the alluring proſpect of glory and of rank by arms, ſo attractive to enthuſiaſtic minds, was to his view cloſed for ever: nay, he could not acquire, at leaſt he could not retain, and tranſmit to his poſterity, being Catholics, ANY REAL PROPERTY. Now, I aſk any man, who can keep his reaſon unclouded, and his opinions unprejudiced, is it preſumeable, is it reaſonable, or natural, to conclude, that the coincidence of two ſuch powerful principles could have continued upwards of half a century unconſequential and inoperative? I make no account of proſelyteiſm, or open recantations upon either ſide; I am writing on no religious controverſy: God forbid! I reſpect, I honour, and I love ALL good men of ALL perſuaſions: yet I will venture to hazard the aſſertion, that Faſhion has ſome influence, even on religion; and that Self-intereſt has more: the ſtrict Catholic perſuaſion was rather going out of faſhion of late days, until religion became, unhappily, the handmaid of politics, and until ſome very deep men, ſome very ingenious, and ſome very able men, contrived to make even the prejudices of the moſt oppoſite tenets,

auxiliary

auxiliary to the ſchemes of private ambition and of perſonal aggrandizement. He has read the hiſtory of his own times with ſtrange inaccuracy, who can be ignorant of this; and he has conſidered the human heart ſuperficially indeed, who can deny it.

If then, it be conceded to me, that I have deduced my calculation from pure, and undeniable *facts*; I muſt take leave to alter your proportion of the two religions, from one fourth into two fifths; and from the ſame reaſons I have mentioned before, I muſt uſe a ſimilar liberty ſtill further to reduce your aſſertion, that the Proteſtant tenures at this day, are nine tenths of the whole property of Ireland. The Iriſh Catholic, at this day, can acquire, can enjoy, and can tranſmit REAL Property. The induſtry, the abilities, the good fortune, and the good ſenſe, of numbers of that perſuaſion, have enabled them to make large fortunes; they have ſeen their intereſts, uſed their ability, and purchaſed land. But taking the caſe upon your own ſhewing, and ſuppoſing the Proteſtant occupiers to hold nine tenths of all the lands in the kingdom, would it mend the matter to ſend many, or any of thoſe very landlords off their own eſtates, to ſerve in a Britiſh or United Parliament; and to expend the rents and produce of thoſe very eſtates, in the neceſſaries, the manufacturers, the arts, and the luxuries, not of their own tenantry, or of their own country, but of another people in another kingdom? Would it ſerve to tranquilize the mind, would it conciliate the attachment of the Catholic tenant, who now has his landlord on the ſpot, witneſs to his loſſes, and willing to relieve him; would it ſerve *him*, think you, to ſend a griping *Steward* to his farm, and have his laſt guinea eviſcerated from him, to be changed, perhaps, that hour into an Engliſh Bill; not *here* to be beſtowed in the relief of want, encouragement of arts, or even the conſumption of luxuries; but, *there* to be eaten at a feaſt, drank with a miſtreſs, or loſt upon a die!!!

Sir, this is, believe me, no highly coloured picture

of the effects to be expected from an Union; ONE AND INDIVISIBLE.

In the following paragraphs of your work, you repreſent the conſequences which you ſay muſt reſult from the free admiſſion of the Catholics to complete political equality, and which you ſtate to be, Repeal of the Teſt and Supremacy Acts—Re-introduction of the Pope's Juriſdiction, &c. &c.: ſurely I ſhall not be expected to ſtop to debate ſuch improbable events. I incline to think the prime cauſe neceſſary to their production, will never have exiſtence. Let us not waſte time upon *poſſible* matters, or loſe ſight, even for a moment, of the grand queſtion, UNION OR NO UNION! Would to God, we could claſs that attempt amongſt REMOTE contingencies!

But to come, at length, to compleat argumentative preciſion:

In page 16 of your book, Sir, you regularly reduce and condenſe "the natural effects of a favourable legiſlative Union," into heads; and you dreſs theſe heads very much in the form of axioms, "Firſt, ſecondly, thirdly, fourthly." I ſhall diſcuſs them EVERY ONE; and before I begin, ſhall juſt make one general obſervation; namely, that by the expreſſion "favourable legiſlative Union," you are "BEGGING THE QUESTION." What right have we to pre-ſuppoſe England would perſevere in cramming "a favourable Union" down our throats; and inſiſt on *loading* Ireland, her dear Siſter, "*nolens, volens*," with Privileges, Rights, Exemptions, Immunities, and Advantages of all kinds; which, if not taken and ſubtracted from her proper SELF, muſt drop from the moon? Will ſhe ſay to Ireland, "Take HALF my trade, but I will keep ALL my taxes," Thus was ſhe "monſtrous kind," when ſhe ALLURED us to a SIMPLE REPEAL, then WHEEDLED us to take her abſolute RENUNCIATION; and at laſt COAXED us to accept of a FREE TRADE. Truſt me, I ſhould be ſincerely ſorry, cautious, and ſuſpicious, were I now to ſee her COMPLIMENTING us with your "favourable Union."

Union," If ever England, by her engines, by her arts, or by her arms, ſhall be able to tempt, to beſot, or to provoke us to this SELF-DESTRUCTION of the vital principle of our POLITICAL EXISTENCE, if ever ſhe ſhall be able to force, or to perſuade us to commit upon ourſelves, this great CONSTITUTIONAL SUICIDE, the only poſthumous favour we can hope from the judgment of poſterity, will be,——their tearful verdict—NATIONAL LUNACY!

But let me not wander from my original: you lay it down as granted, that "the natural effects, which would reſult from your "favourable Union," muſt be theſe:

Firſt, "The Empire would have but one legiſlature, one organ of the public will, and the dangers which ariſe from an *imperium in imperio*, from two ſupreme powers, would be advoided." Conſtitutionally ſpeaking, I hold the Lords and Commons of Ireland to be but parts of an "*imperium*," and no "*Supreme power*," without the King: their Acts are powerleſs without the King. The King of England is "*ipſo facto*," King of Ireland; and until it is ſhewn to me, that the King of Ireland is ſubordinate to, controulable by, or dependant upon the King of England, I cannot bring myſelf to think, that the legiſlature of Ireland, as at preſent eſtabliſhed, is a "Supreme power," included in, ſubordinate to, controulable by, and dependent upon any other "Supreme power" under Heaven.

At the time I ſat down to anſwer your arguments, it was moſt devoutly my intention, not to deſiſt, until I ſhould have traced you, Sir, through all the paradoxes of your ingenious work, even to the laſt tittle of your laſt page; but, on throwing my eye over the ſcattered ſheets, which already lie written on my table, and conſidering I have not yet got farther on my journey, than to your 16th page, I am apprehenſive I ſhould exceed, in point of bulk, the limits uſually preſcribed to pamphlets of this nature: for the preſent, therefore I am conſtrained, indeed reluctantly, to take

my leave. What I have yet further to obſerve upon the ſubject, ſhall make the matter of a ſecond letter; and as my heart is in the cauſe, you may conjecture that I ſhall not long continue, Sir, in your debt. In a very few days you ſhall hear from me again; and, if in what I have hitherto written, an expreſſion, or a word have eſcaped me, to give you perſonal pain or offence, I beg you to believe it very far from my intention.

I have the honour to be,

SIR,

Your very humble, and

obedient Servant,

No. 80, *Marlborough Street,*
10*th December* 1798.

PEMBERTON RUDD.

POSTSCRIPT.

I CANNOT be prevailed on to let this go to the Preſs, without, (though it is travelling beyond the regular order I had preſcribed to myſelf,) without giving you ſome ſhort hint of my ſentiments and feelings, when I read your very unkind and unmerited aſperſions, on thoſe glorious and patriotic characters, (the founders, in fact, of the Iriſh conſtitution, as the YEOMANRY ſince have been its Saviours,) I mean the original Volunteers of 1779 and 1782. That it may not be thought that I could miſtake, miſ-ſtate, or miſrepreſent your true meaning, I tranſcribe the whole paſſage. It is in the 27th page of your work, where ſpeaking on the peculiar aptitude of a ſeaſon, (ſuch as this) of irritations and of turbulance, as beſt ſuited to the introduction of conſtitutional innovations, becauſe readieſt, offering the means to rivet them upon us; you deliver your opinion in theſe explicit and *extraordinary* terms:—

" As

" As to a time of war, if it is true, that the Volunteers " took advantage of the embarraſſments of Great " Britain, in the laſt war, to aſſert the independence of " our parliament; it is likewiſe true, that the United " Iriſhmen, in the preſent war, have taken advantage " of the ſuppoſed weakneſs of Great Britain, to play " the game of ſeparation. When, therefore, the enemies " of the Empire take advantage of a time of war and " embarraſſment, to effect its ruin, we ſhould turn " againſt them their own game, and make uſe of a " time of war to eſtabliſh its ſecurity."

Here is a propoſition moſt logically conſtructed with two premiſes and a concluſion. Premiſes how incongruous! how monſtrous the concluſion! The original Volunteers of Ireland are here made to correſpond and agree, and are put in moſt pointed oppoſition to the horde of convicted, or confeſſed traitors, the United Iriſhmen of 1798: their actions are deſcribed in terms as injurious as any Johnſon or Sheridan could furniſh: " *to take advantage,*" is appropriate to ſwindlers and robbers; " *to aſſert,*" as it is here uſed, infers unjuſt aſſumption, and inſinuates unfounded claim. The ſecond ſentence, deſignates the United Iriſhmen by preciſely the ſame expreſſion beſtowed upon the Volunteers. " *The United Iriſhmen in the preſent war—the Volunteers in the laſt war*"—both *have taken advantage.* It is an unlucky phraſe; and little mended by occurring yet a third time in the concluſion. " *When, therefore, enemies of the empire take advantage,*" &c. Enemies of the empire! Who? What enemies? And of what empire? Is it the original Volunteers of Ireland, enemies! Is it thoſe very men to whom you yourſelf, then an Officer of the Houſe of Commons, did in the Seſſion of 1782, tranſmit, at leaſt, TRANSCRIBE, the unanimous thanks of the Parliament of Ireland, for being the ſteady Friends and Soldiers of their country—The glorious founders of our Independency and Conſtitution! Are theſe the enemies you mean? Are theſe the men you NOW ſay were " *effecting the ruin*" of their country? Are theſe the

"*gameſters*," againſt whom you propoſe "*we ſhould turn*" and unite? Who is meant by WE? Who *can* be meant? Not the United Iriſhmen: they are alſo players of the ſame game you ſay: not the corporate bodies of Ireland: not the Houſes of Parliament of Ireland: they have all recorded their ſentiments, their approbation, and their thanks: not the Merchants of Ireland, they enjoy that very "Free Trade" the Volunteers procured them: not the Lawyers of Ireland, they know their conſtitution, and they love it; and when they entered the profeſſion, Sir, they ſwore to KEEP it: not the Yeomanry of Ireland, they armed to protect, ſecure, and improve, what the Volunteers armed to aſſert, eſtabliſh, and maintain. There is not then, (and I am proud to ſay it!) there is not then in ALL Ireland, one ſingle rank, claſs, or deſcription of men, to whom your *patriotic* exhortation is, or can be applicable. As you have choſen *Engliſh* arguments, you muſt ſelect an *Engliſh* audience, and you are SURE of pleaſing. As to us, leave us, for God's ſake, as you found us. We have been in a fever, the criſis is paſt, and we are mending; do not *bleed* or *phyſic* us into a *conſumption*, and all may be well yet. Our *Conſtitution* is not *ſo* bad as *you* would make it.

In my next, (for poſitively I am juſt concluding,) you ſhall have the thoughts of an unambitious man, upon that part of your pamphlet, in which you exult, not a little, at the wholeſome curb and reſtrictive effect of an Union; in detaching young barriſters from political purſuits: chaining them like *clerks* and ſcriveners to their deſks, and putting an effectual ſtop to thoſe *impudent* ſtrides by which they are ſo apt to *thruſt* themſelves into the Houſe of Commons: not forgetting to ſuggeſt to you one trifling omiſſion which you made in your catalogue of advantages, that are to accrue to ſuitors, after an Union, in having their cauſes argued and managed by lawyers, who will, *then*, no longer have their brains bewildered with political ſpeculations: but you ſtrangely forgot to mention the great additional advantage which the ſaid ſuitors muſt

derive

derive from the RE-TRANSPORTATION of the APPELLANT JURISDICTION: whereby they will have their cauſes *finally* decided on, in a much ſhorter, quicker, eaſier, and leſs expenſive manner, no doubt, at the Bar of the Britiſh Houſe of Lords than they could poſſibly have at home here in the capital of their own country: Not to mention its being a fooliſh, gaudy feather in the cap of the Iriſh Conſtitution, with which we dreſſed ourſelves ſo giddily in 1781. I think I remember an illumination when the Appellant Juriſdiction was brought home to us: it will be perfectly in character to illuminate again, when it ſhall be taken away, away for EVER, by the conſummation of an Iriſh Union, one and indiviſible!

P. R.

BRITISH MUSEUM

FINIS.

UNION WITH IRELAND.

This Day is Published, in One large Volume, 4to. price 1 l. 10 s. or on Royal Paper, 1 l. 15 s.

THE

HISTORY of the UNION between ENGLAND and SCOTLAND,

WITH

A Collection of ORIGINAL PAPERS relating thereto, by DANIEL DE FOE.—An INTRODUCTION upon the Conſequences and Probability of a like Union with Ireland, by J. L. DE LOLME.—A copious INDEX, by the Rev. SAMUEL AYSCOUGH;—and, a LIFE of DE FOE,

By GEORGE CHALMERS, F. R. S. S. A.

*** The preſent Situation of Affairs in Ireland, having induced all Well-wiſhers to both Kingdoms to hope that a Union, ſimilar to that with Scotland, might, as it probably will, ſoon take place; thoſe Gentlemen who wiſh to be informed of the Manner of ſuch a Proceeding, will find, in the above Work, Precedents and Information of the utmoſt Importance to the Commercial and Political World.

Printed for JOHN STOCKDALE, Piccadilly;

Of whom may be had, on the ſame Subject,

De Lolme's Britiſh Empire in Europe, 4to. 5 *s.*

Hiſtorical Tracts, by Sir John Davies, with a Life, by Geo. Chalmers, Eſq; 8vo. 5 *s.*

Utility of an Union between Great Britain and Ireland, conſidered by a Friend to both Countries, 1 *s.*

Thoughts on an Union, by Joſhua Spencer, Eſq; Barriſter at Law, 1 *s.*

Report of the Secret Committee of the Commons of Ireland, with a large Map of Ireland, 3 *s.* 6*d.*

Report of the Secret Committee of the Lords, with a Plan of Dublin, 1 *s.* 6*d.*

Speech of the Lord Chancellor of Ireland. By Authority. 1 *s.* 6*d.*

Trial of the Sheares's for High Treaſon, by William Ridgeway, Eſq. 8vo. 3 *s.*

Arguments for and againſt an Union conſidered, 6*d.*